



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,755	02/19/2002	Baskaran Dharmarajan	MS1-1055US	9369
22801	7590	08/11/2006	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			TRAN, TONGOC	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/081,755	DHARMARAJAN, BASKARAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tongoc Tran	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 30, 2006 has been entered. Claims 1, 12, 13, 17, 23 and 27 have been amended. Claims 1-29 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. *Applicant contends that the cited prior art, Brown, does not teach "in an event that the session is no longer authenticated, persisting as a pending request at the server, the request from the client" as recited in claim 1. Brown teaches that a query is made to verify whether the client has been authenticated before the request is processed. In the event the client is not authenticated, the server directs the client to a webpage where the client is to enter login information to be authenticated (see Brown [0029]). Brown further teaches that if the client is authenticated, a query is made to check if the session is still connected, if the session is connected, the server will process the request, if the session is not connected, the client is directed to be authenticated (see Brown, Fig. 4a, and page 3, [0029-0030]). Applicant recites "in an event that the session is subsequently re-authenticated, the server processing the pending request". The*

Art Unit: 2134

processing of the request that Applicant recites is after the client is authenticated. Therefore, Examiner is interpreting the request as process request directed to application server while in Brown the request that WAG received is a request for authentication, e.g. login. In Applicant's remark, Applicant stated, "when a request is submitted from the client to the server, the re-authentication system verifies that the session is secure. If the re-authentication system cannot verify that the session is secure, the system persists (e.g. saves or maintains) the request and directs the client to re-authenticate the session. When the client session is re-established, the re-authentication system directs the server to process the saved request, instead of requiring that the request be re-submitted from the client (Application, page 2, line 25-page 3, line 8). The portion where Applicant referring to in the Specification appears to referring the request as directed to request made to the application server, e.g. sending email message. Therefore, in light of this interpretation, Examiner is interpreting the request taught by Fig. 4a in Brown to be request to be authenticated when it is determined that the session has been expired. Since Brown clearly mentioned that if the client is authenticated and the session is not expired, the client is authorized to view website content according to the user's identity (Brown, [0030]). Applicant further contends that Kurowski's teaching of persisting the request is differs from the claimed invention. "Kurowski storing data locally, rather than transmitting the data because a network connection is down..." and the combination of Brown and Kurowski does not result in the claimed invention. (remark, page 14-15). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Brown teaches the

Art Unit: 2134

concept providing the user access to Internet e-mail through a web proxy server.

Whenever the server receive request from the user, a query is made to determine whether the user is authenticated, if the user is authenticated, a query is made to determine whether the session is expired. In any event, the user is required to authenticate or re-authenticated in order to access to email service. While Applicant claims the novelty of the invention is persisting the request so that user's work would not be disrupted or lost when the user request can not be processed unless the user is re-authenticated. Kurowski teaches the concept of storing the user request for the task server in a persistent queue when the network is down in order to preserve the work (Kurowski, [0241] "keeping track of when the network connection is down, and then initiating the saving of data in the local disk for later sending to the task server"). The reason Kurowski is introduced is to show the well known concept of saving the information in file for later used so that user does not have to resubmitting the information again in the later time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2134

Claims 1-3, and 5-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (U.S. Patent Application Application (U.S. 2003/0061288 A1, hereinafter Brown) in view of Kurowski et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0019844, hereinafter Kurowski)

In respect to claim 1, Brown discloses a method comprising:

Establishing an authenticated session between a server and a client; receiving at the server, a request from the client; Determining whether the session is still authenticated (see Brown Fig. 4, and page 3, [0028] – [0030], “a query is made whether user is authenticated. If not, a directive ...is sent back to the client”; “when the user is authenticated, a query is made as to whether the session is ended...if the session is still not ended, a server for the WAG transcoder farm queries user database for accessibility transforms to be applied for the requested device...”). Brown discloses directing the client to be authenticated in the event the client is not authenticated, but does not explicitly disclose persisting the client request as a pending request at the server. However, Kurowski discloses a persistent queue management subsystem is used for storing request from a client for the server when network is down (see Kurowski, [0208], “for some of the operations, the domain objects might depend on other subsystem that provide a persistence mechanism either to the local disk or to a server”, [0241], “storing any command for task server in a persistent queue when the connection is down”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the persistent queue for storing client request to the task server when connection is

Art Unit: 2134

down taught by Kurowski with the teaching of verifying if the client is authenticated before processing the request taught by Brown for the benefit of saving the work for the task server to be processed when connection is reestablished (see Kurowski, [0241]).

In respect to claim 2, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the determining comprises verifying an authentication token associated with the client (see Brown, page 2, [0021]).

In respect to claim 3, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 2 wherein the verifying comprises verifying that the authentication token has not timed out (see Brown, page 2, [0030]).

In respect to claim 5, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 2 wherein the authentication token is part of the request received from the client (see Brown, page 2 [0021]).

In respect to claim 6, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 2 wherein the authentication token is encrypted (see Brown, page 1, [0010]).

In respect to claim 7, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 1 wherein persisting the request comprises storing the request in a file (see Kurowski, page 18, [0241]).

In respect to claim 8, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 1 wherein persisting the request comprises storing the request in a database (see Kurowski, page 18, [0241]).

In respect to claim 9, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 1 further comprising directing the client to authenticate the session (see Brown 3, [0029]).

In respect to claim 10, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 9 wherein directing the client to authenticate the session comprises:

Directing the client to a login module; and directing the an address (see Brown, page 3, [0029]).

In respect to claim 11, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 10 wherein the address associated with the pending request is a URL (see Kurowski, page 18, [0241]).

In respect to claim 12, 13, 18, 22, 23, and 25-27, the claimed limitation are similar to claim 1. Therefore, claims 12, 13, 18, 22, 23 and 25-27 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2134

In respect to claim 14, Brown and Kurowski disclose the system of claim 13 further comprising an authentication redirect generator configured to generate an instruction to redirect the client to obtain re-authorization (see Brown, page 18 [0029-0030], "A query...is made as to whether the user is authenticated. If not, a directive...is sent back to client device 10, typically in the form of a web page, requesting content for the user to log onto and/or register with the WAG services offered through proxy machine").

In respect to claims 15-17, claimed limitations are similar to claims 2, 11 and 13. Therefore, claims 15-17 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 19 and 21, the claimed limitations are system claims that are similar to method claims 3 and 8. Therefore, claims 19 and 20 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claim 20, Brown and Kurowski disclose the system of claim 18 wherein the authentication redirect generator is further configured to direct the client to access the requestg that is stored (see Brown, page 3, [0030]).

In respect to claim 24, Brown and Kurowski do not disclose wherein the application server and the authentication entity are implemented as one server. However, having a central server performing authentication and processing user request is old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2134

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a central server for authentication and application purposes as a matter of design choices.

In respect to claim 28, the claimed limitation is similar to claim 14.

Therefore, claim 28 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claim 29, the claimed limitation is similar to claim 20.

therefore, claim 20 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (U.S. Patent Application Application (U.S. 2003/0061288 A1, hereinafter Brown) in view of Kurowski et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0019844, hereinafter Kurowski) and further in view of Polizzi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0023122).

In respect to claim 4, Brown and Kurowski disclose the method of claim 2. Brown and Kurowski do not disclose wherein the authentication token is a cookie stored by the client. However, Polizzi discloses cookies based authentication for web log in access (see Polizzi, page 10, [0074]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement cookie based authentication taught by Polizzi with Brown's authentication system and Kurowski's storing of persistent request for the benefit of authentication cookie cached in client's system while client is in session.

Art Unit: 2134

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3843. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jacques Louis-Jacques can be reached on (571) 272-3962. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TT

Jacques Louis-Jacques
JACQUES LOUIS-JACQUES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100